

DR. ARMSTRONG'S

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

TO THE

“Protestant Electoral Union”

OF

WOLVERHAMPTON,

FORMED AFTER THE POPISH RIOTS, SUBSEQUENT TO
MR. MURPHY'S VISIT TO THAT TOWN.

“That which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the housetops.”—LUKE xii, 3.

Therefore “THE CONFESSIONAL” must be “UNMASKED.”

For, saith Christ, “Heaven and earth shall pass away but my Word shall not pass away.”—MATTHEW xxiv, 35.

BURSLEM:

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF SAMUEL BOWERING, MARKET PLACE,
1867.

ADDRESS.

The matter which claims our attention on this occasion relates not to the peculiar tenets of any of the Protestant denominations of England, but to the difference existing between the grand principles of Protestantism in general on the one side, and the principles of a foreign sect called Popery on the other, and to the extraordinary apparent connivance of men in authority with the latter system.

I propose considering the secret tactics of that system at the present time.

I. The direct tactics by Popish leaders. One of the cunning devices of our common enemy is to try and sow dissention between the different Protestant denominations, more particularly between the Church of England and the Nonconformist bodies in general, and between one portion of the Church and another, and to set us, if possible at loggerheads one with another; acting somewhat on the system of the lawyer, who was asked to adjudicate between two claimants for a native oyster,—he sagely said—"a shell to him and a shell to thee, the middle is the lawyer's fee; and it is truly mortifying to see how utterly blind to these tactics some Protestants are, and that they do not see that an enemy, which mortally hates both Churchmen and Dissenters, is making a cat's paw of them both, for the sake of domineering over all. For the Popish opinion of Dissenters, see the Popish *Tablet*, where Father Oakley (a pervert) says—"We (Catholics) had been snubbed so successfully, that we thought it gain to make common cause with the sects of yesterday, (Dissenters,) and pinning ourselves to their sleeves, to get if it might be a share in the poor pickings of concession, which with mighty professions and small fruit, were vouchsafed to us; what can have led Catholics to detach themselves from this ignoble, tho' profitable alliance, except a growing consciousness of their strength and nobility."—*Tablet*, 14th May, 1859. Thus, after making a step-ladder of Dissenters, whom they call ignoble, they boast of kicking the ladder down! and the cat's paw made of the Church through the Puseyites—whom they despise just as much as they do Dissenters—is notorious.

As an instance of manœuvring, I may mention a late Popish Address on the "Confessional," in relation to Mr. Murphy's lectures, after an impotent and I must add an impudent effort to cast contempt upon Colonel Brockman, a Dissenter, the writer adds "and if the Lecturer can further succeed in getting some Anglican-Clergyman, *sufficiently forgetful of his position*, to take the chair for him or sit by his side, *his preparations are all complete*;" I may remark here that this same taking the chair for Mr. Murphy seems to be a terrible

grievance in the eyes of Popery; the same crime has brought upon my devoted head several threats of murder from some of Dr. Ullathorne's anonymous allies, some of the "lambs" of Popery, *allies* they are, for they war against the same persons and for the same crime, and I have not heard of the Doctor publicly denouncing the wickedness of these bloodthirsty allies.

Thus it appears that the great object with respect to me is for the writer (who takes the less truculent department) to try and shame me, and for the *allies* (who take the bullying department) to try and frighten me from taking the chair for Mr. Murphy, my chairmanship is to be got rid of by hook or by crook, and at all hazards. Does the writer think I am such a gull as not to see through this *ruse*? I shall neither be cajoled by Dr. Ullathorne, nor frightened by his allies from supporting Mr. Murphy.

But really when a man comes out thus publicly to reprimand a military officer of birth and education, animadverting upon his position and standing, because he chose to support a Protestant Lecturer of unimpeachable character, whose father was murdered before his eyes for turning Protestant, and when the writer also pretends to give his opinion that an English Clergyman is "forgetful of his position," who in the exercise of *his* discretion, thinks it right also to support such a lecturer, whilst exposing what he believes to be the impostures of Popery.

I say when such a man presumes to instruct military officers and Clergymen upon what their duties are, it is high time to enquire who this wonderful writer is; surely he must be some man of high status in the country, and no doubt a very disinterested censor of Protestant Officers and Protestant Clergymen; this man who searches the army list for the names of retired officers, with the gentlemanlike intention of finding them impostors, and who dictates to Clergymen what chair they ought or ought not take at public meetings. Who then is this magnate?

Alas, alas, he is not either the Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's forces, nor yet the Archbishop of Canterbury, but (mirabile dictu) he is only a Popish titular Bishop!!!

Did it ever occur to this Popish Bishop of Birmingham, (save the mark!) that whilst he was searching the army list for Colonel Brockman's name, his own name does not appear in the clergy list?

And again I say, who is this high and mighty dignitary of a foreign corrupt Anti-English Church, who pretends to pronounce upon what is suitable or not to the dignity of an English Clergyman?

Who I say is this high and mighty one? a man who has no recognized status whatever in the country; *other* dissenting ministers, of a purer creed, are gentlemen of England with English sympathies, and the love of England in their hearts, but this man is the nominee of a foreign hostile petty prince and priest, who has most "insolently and insidiously," as the Prime Minister of England declared, pretended to give him an English territorial title, an enemy to our Church, and to all Christian denominations in the land, and to the independence of our nation! and of *course therefore* a most disinterested opponent of all who oppose "the Confessional."

Most disinterested indeed ! What would people say if I were to rebuke a Popish Priest because he supported Dr. Manning in calling us all "heathen," and if I should add that the Priest "forgot his position" in so calling us ? Why a Priest would be just *in* "his position" for so calling us, for his Church teaches him that we are heathen ; and I am *in* "my position," when I say the "Confessional" is an ungodly institution, for my Church teaches me so.

My Church's remarks upon the text—James v. 16, "confess your faults one to another,," are as follows,—“and whereas the adversaries go about to wrest this place to maintain their *auricular confession*, withall, they greatly deceive themselves, and do shamefully deceive others, for if this text ought to be understood of *auricular confession*, then the Priests are as much bound to confess themselves to the lay people as the lay people are bound to confess themselves unto them.”—*Homily on repentance*.

And again, the same homily says, "IT IS MOST EVIDENT AND PLAIN, that this *auricular confession* hath not the warrant of God's word."

I wish to remark here *particularly* that the Church of England in the above calls Popish holders of "AURICULAR" CONFESSION her "*adversaries*" what then are we to say to the loyalty of Dr. Pusey, *et hoc genus omne*, who want to be united to such "adversaries," whom his acknowledged Church denounces as adversaries ? Is not this treachery of the deepest dye ? I should like an answer to that.

But forsooth I "forget my position" when I declare myself an "adversary" to my Church's adversaries !

No, I don't forget my "position," I remember it well ; how very zealous Dr. Ullathorne has become lest I "forget my position," will any man of common sense believe that it is zeal for "my position" which causes him to deprecate my "forgetting it ? No, no, the sore point is that my position, such as it is, gives some moral support to Mr. Murphy ; what does the Doctor care whether I forget my "position" or not, if the dear sweet "confessional" can only be protected from harm.

Does this man think that I care for his pretended respect for my "position," which is only intended to throw dust in my eyes, or that by flattering me with my "position," I will be cajoled into refusing my moral support to Mr. Murphy, a truly christian man, though I decline fighting the "lamb's" of Popery with broken chairs and carnal weapons. Dr. Ullathorne calls Mr. Murphy, "that *unhappy man*" does the Doctor allude to Mr. Murphy's *unhappiness* for the murder of his father, whom he saw stoned to death by the Popish lambs ? if he meant that, it was both bad taste and bad policy to reproach him with *unhappiness* produced by the ruffians of his own sect ! *unhappy man* indeed ! That is "an unhappy man" indeed who makes light of a son's grief for the murder of his father !

But according to this gentleman, forsooth I am "forgetful of my position," because I stand by Mr. Murphy. "Forgetful of my position !" I did not know before that in this man's eyes I have any "position" at all ; Dr. Manning, who is his acknowledged superior,

only recognizes me as a "heathen," and therefore as a clergyman I have no "position," and therefore the more I lowered myself (which he pretends I have done) in supporting Mr. Murphy, the better pleased he ought to be, and the more I would be acting according to "my position," or rather my want of "position," in fact my "heathenism!"

What a farce it is for a man to assume to be Bishop of Birmingham, (by the grace of the Pope,) and thus impudently ignore my Bishop's "position," and then talk of "my position" as being so high that I "forgot" it when I sat beside Mr. Murphy, the son of a murdered father, a gentleman fully equal in character and "position" to Dr. Ullathorne. And what a farce it is for *the ignorer of our Bishops* to compliment other English Clergymen, who are too genteel to support a Protestant lecturer such as Mr. Murphy, because that would be displeasing to Dr. Ullathorne, for my own part I am too much a Churchman to value the good opinion of a man who laughs in his sleeve at my Church, as he does at any Protestant Church, and who must chuckle at his success in hoodwinking by flattery the poor clerical dupes who think his good opinion worth having. *Of course* Dr. Ullathorne approves of those Clergymen who would not support Mr. Murphy, and *of course* he disapproves of those who would support him. I must try and live as well as I can under his disapprobation.

Other men may be cajoled by Popish nonsense, but I have not the least idea of allowing him or any other Priest to think he can impose upon me.

He shan't have the twofold and opposite advantages of (on the one side) flattering me as to my "position" when it suits his purpose, with his tongue in his cheek at my "heathenism" all the time, and (on the other side) treating me as a heretic, without "position," and worthy only of PERSECUTION for being a heretic; a persecution which, for want of legal power may be perpetrated through Watch Committees or Stipendiary Magistrates; or when suitable, by altar denunciations, followed by "lambs" armed with broken chairs, and threats of "bullets" and "Greek fire," which latter have been tried upon me. (but in vain)

This very man publicly accused me some time since of mistranslating the Popish Bishops' oath in the *Pontificale Romanum*, in which those Bishops swear to "persecute" heretics "to the utmost of their power;" he asserted that the word "persecute" was a mistranslation of the word "persequar" in his first published letter on the subject, and when I brought him to book, he *as publicly admitted that his own authorized books translated the original as I did*; thus in one letter he denied my translation, and in the next he was obliged to admit it; these facts I will prove from published documents, if he challenges their truth, *and some other facts along with them*; and these facts show what value is to be attached to the assertion that the "Confessional Unmasked" consists of foul translations also. I should like to know whether the translation from Liguori in the "Confessional Unmasked" is not more modest than the original, on page 58—"an autem sit mortale viro" &c., when the translator was absolutely obliged to leave

a word untranslated. I want an answer to this! The same omission was obliged to be made in page 62, in the translation from the same filthy saint—where a species of beastliness is mentioned, which it is marvellous even a filthy saint would ever think of, and which certainly “required no ghost” to tell people was an abominable sin—nature would teach the wickedness of such things; though it is treated as a light affair by the saint’s authority. I want an answer to this too!

But he says “I forget my position,” but I have not forgotten “my position in the “persecution” controversy; I know what “my position” would be if his Church had her way—I should be consigned to torture or death, in proof of which I shall just quote a note from an authorized Popish Bible. The note is on Matthew xiii, 29—“The good must tolerate the evil when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger and disturbance of the whole Church; otherwise, when ill men, be they heretics or other malefactors, may be punished or suppressed without disturbance or hazard of the good, they may and ought by public authority, (hear this Stipendiaries) either spiritual or temporal, to be chastized or executed.” But perhaps Popery is altered since that Bible was published, viz:—in 1818? altered! hear this Popish statement, —“You (Protestants) ask if the Roman Catholics were lord in the land and you were in a minority, if not in numbers, yet in power, what would he do to you? that we say would depend upon circumstances, if it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate you; probably he might even hang you: be assured of one thing, he would never tolerate you for the sake of the ‘glorious principles of civil and religious liberty.’ ” (*Hear that ye gentlemen, who on ‘civil and religious liberty’ principles will give these gentle lambs their swing, in order that they may swing you on the gallows!*) “Shall I hold out hopes to the Protestant, that I will not meddle with his creed, if he will not meddle with mine!” *Hear that ye magistrates who won’t allow us to meddle with their confession—they will meddle with your Protestantism though.* “Shall I lead him to think that religion is a matter of private opinion, and tempt him to forget that he has no more right to his religious views than he has to my purse, my house, or my life-blood?” (*this liberal religion which you are petting, tells you, you have no right to your religion, and she will hang you if you persevere in it.*) “No, Catholicism is,” says the writer, “the most intolerant of creeds, it is intolerance itself, for it is the truth itself.” *Rambler, (Roman Catholic Magazine,) September, 1851.*

That is the position of all heretics in the eyes of Popery, and that is the system which is to be petted and pampered by Stipendiary Magistrates, and men who protest against it are to be taboo’d and denied protection!! And certain so-called “High Churchmen!!” of the Church of England, (Anglicans forsooth, the word English is too vulgar and Protestant,) who suppose, because they listen to such flatterers as Popish Bishops, that they have a whit more “position” in the eyes of Popery, than the dissenting ministers of any denomination, only flatter themselves in vain. Not even Dr. Pusey, (unless

he is a dispensed Papist) nor any other "ANGLICAN" is in a whit better "position" than the Evangelical Clergyman, nay, than Wesleyan, Independent, or Baptist Ministers. I don't therefore hesitate to avow that my sympathies go more with Di-senting Ministers, (who at all events, though they differ a little from us, will acknowledge us Protestant Clergymen to be fellow christians and not call us heathens.) My sympathies are infinitely more with Dissenters than with Popery. *More, did I say?* I have no sympathy whatever with Popery, except the christian sympathy of pity, which I am bound to feel for those who are destroying their own souls; whilst for Dissenters of all denominations, who hold fast by the great head of the Church, to the exclusion of all other mediators, I profess the strongest sympathy and love.

Submission is what Popery wants, so that Dr. Pusey's *Irenicon* is unmitigated nonsense, and just as little to be tolerated by Popery as my outspoken Protestantism. Popery wants to plant her foot on the necks both of Churchmen and Dissenters, and the sooner all Protestants realize this the better. We Protestant Clergymen cannot do without our natural allies—the Protestants of all denominations; nor can they do without us; if we are to maintain our civil and religious liberties against the aggressions of Popery, we must maintain them together.

Nothing, in my mind, can be more contemptible than the mean and grovelling attempt of certain so-called Churchmen, to humble themselves before Popery, and imitate her with a view to conciliation, when that ungodly system will yield nothing; and when its Priests if they would only speak their minds, would no doubt express a much greater contempt for that mean truckling party in the Church, than for true Protestants within her pale, who hesitate not to subscribe with hand and heart, our Church's own declaration—that the dogmas of Popery are "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

Protestant Clergymen (according to Popery, and I agree with her for the nonce) have no more title to the name of Priests (as sacrificers) than Dissenting Ministers, therefore in their sacrificial vestments, their incense, their candles, &c., they forget "their position." Such things used by Churchmen, are all mockery in the eyes of Popery, as they are in the eyes of Protestants. It is truly amusing to hear some Ritual gentlemen protesting that there is a great difference, in fact opposition between Romish and what they are pleased to call Anglican doctrine. They tell us for instance, that the Church of England article does indeed protest against the "*Romish doctrine* of Purgatory, pardons, &c., but then it does not protest against the "*Anglican doctrine* of Purgatory, pardons, &c.; then they tell you they don't believe in the *Romish* doctrine of the real presence, but in the *Anglican* doctrine, &c.; in fact if we believe these worthies, we may believe all *Popish* doctrines, but only baptise them with the title *Anglican*. Did you ever hear of what is the opposite of cockadoodle-doo? do you give it up? Cockadoodle-don't. Such is the difference between "Romanism" and "Anglicanism," a difference in sound but not in sense. Something like that between Pompey and Cæsar,

who, the negro said, were so like one another that nobody could distinguish one from the other, specially Pompey.

But with reference to the "Confessional," the exposure of which is evidently the sore point with Popery; the writer, Dr. Ullathorne, tells us of provision made for cases of improper solicitation by Priests to females in the Confessional, he tells us the "the penitent is bound to denounce the Confessor to the Bishop." Ho, ho! this is tolerably suggestive—this provision implies a possibility (at least) of females being solicited in the Confessional. Now I would ask Dr. Ullathorne what security can be given to any father that his daughter, to any husband that his wife, to any brother that his sister, has not been or is not solicited, and possibly seduced in the Confessional? And are daughters, sisters and wives, to be left to the haphazard of whether the priest is a pure man or not? Clearly from the above provision in such cases, the safety of wives, daughters and sisters, is all a chance; but then says Popery—consider the provision, that the female must denounce the confessor to the Bishop! All very fine, but there are a few considerations which render this denouncing of no value whatever; suppose the Bishop will not believe the penitent—what then? I have heard of an instance where a female was hooted out of a village for daring to say that a holy Priest had seduced her. But suppose the Bishop does believe her, but that he will not punish the delinquent publicly—what then? And suppose even he does so punish him, what consolation will that be to the heart-broken husband, father or brother, who would feel conscious that were it not for the infernal Confessional, the wife, daughter or sister might have retained their innocence and purity. This denouncing after the mischief is done reminds us of the man who was condemned to be hanged—complaining that his counsel had not got him off—never mind, said the blamed counsel—if they hang you I will make it a sore hanging to them. But again, suppose the female, through the wiles of the Priest, be corrupted, and become madly fond of the Priest—and some women have become more *infernally* faithful to their seducers than *virtuously* faithful to their poor deceived husbands—would such, think you, denounce him? and lastly, suppose the Bishop to be just as bad as the Priest, what redress will there be then? I protest I mean nothing offensive by this. I find that attempts have been made to torture such observations into personalities, in order to turn the edge of the sword from cutting into the system. Some Priests have enquired with an air of injured innocence, whether the denouncer of the Confessional alluded to them in particular as being impure—such questions are merely clap-trap; I for instance don't accuse any particular Priest with impurity in the Confessional, I have no doubt some Priests are pure men, I have known such myself—two read their recantation to me, and I believe they were both pure men; and others who remain in the system are no doubt pure in that respect.

Dr. Ullathorne admits (by the above provision) that there is a *possibility* of a Priest being IMPURE in the Confessional; I shall not

be out-done in courtesy—I admit the *possibility* of a bachelor Priest being PURE in the Confessional, some are so constitutionally, but such I fear are but a small minority: the Apostle Paul did not expect all men to be like him. But this denouncing affair is not quite so satisfactory to fathers, husbands and brothers, even by the showing of Peter Dens, who says,—“in this case (of denouncing) however, some are of opinion that *moderation* is to be observed, and that the circumstance of frequency and danger, &c., must be considered.”—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 295. “Moderation!” How very considerate *for the Priest*, but what about the poor father or husband? “Frequency!” If the defilement be not very often, slur it over; listen fathers and brothers! “danger,” make allowance for the temptation! harken fathers and husbands! I consider the institution of the Confessional as a wicked and abominable invention of men, and as calculated to superinduce impurity, both in men and women; and the provision above alluded to implies this. Thus briefly to recapitulate, men must own that the safety of their female relatives who frequent the Confessional, is only a chance; Priests may be very sanctimonious outwardly, but in the Confessional be very much the contrary. Females corrupted will not be likely to denounce the corruptor; even if they do, they may not be believed; and if believed, the Priest may not be publicly punished, for fear of scandal to the Church; and this danger of scandal to the Church may be played off beautifully, even by the Priests who corrupt their penitents, as an argument not to denounce them, and a strong argument it would be with a Popish devotee; and if the Bishop be a chip of the same block as the Priest, and known to be so to the Priest, where is the redress; and take the most favourable supposition—that punishment is properly inflicted—that is no consolation after the mischief is done; and lastly, *Dens* tells us there ought to be “*moderation*” in the denunciation, allowance should be made for the Priest’s “danger,” from the tempting circumstances of the Confessional. Then the “*frequency*” of the defilement should be considered, if it was only a few times for instance, slur it over—that is about the English of “moderation is to be observed.” Faugh! the “Confessional” is an iniquitous system, and cannot be defended for a moment on christian principles, and hence backs of chairs, brickbats, shillalees, pistols and Greek fire, are the only available arguments, along with cajoling mayors and magistrates about threats of bloodshed, if their darling Confessional is assailed. I can quite understand why *some* Priests cleave to the Confessional and are very *jealous* of interference in more senses than one; and why *some* Clergymen would like to get the same privileges as Popish Priests, and also why *some* females wish its continuance; but it is not always that food which is most palatable to *certain* tastes, is the most wholesome. I know many Roman Catholic men don’t like the Confessional. I remember a young lady, the daughter of a Romish father, who, when she turned Protestant, told her he was very glad of it,—for what reason think you? “because,” said he, “you will never go to the Confessional;” I had this account from the young lady’s own lips. I may mention here, that a married clergy could

never carry on the Confessional for any time, their wives would soon put a stop to such suspicious work—they would not like other women to be boxed up with their husbands; and it is only to be marvelled at that husbands will allow *their wives to be boxed up* with bachelor Priests, when *provision is obliged to be made* for solicitation, AS DR. ULLATHORNE HIMSELF ALLOWS. I have no doubt but the celibacy of the clergy was a very convenient arrangement, because of the little difficulty of wives not liking their husbands to be confessors. It appears by husbands allowing wives to go to confession, that women have more regard and care for their husband's purity, than men have for the purity of their wives, for certainly women would never allow their husbands *to be* confessors, though men are stupid enough to let their wives *go to* confessors.

Some Papists have asked for *names* of those Priests who have used the Confessional for immoral purposes, hear the following,—

“THE CONFESSORIAL. The criminal court of Turin has lately been occupied with the hearing of a case which has spread consternation and shame through many of the most respectably connected families in the Sardinian capital, and contributed not a little to increase the feelings of dislike growing up of late towards the Catholic clergy. The trial which has excited such a sensation in Turin was that of Don Gurlino, attached in the capacity of second curate, first to the church of San Carlo, afterwards to that of the Carmelite order. Among his regular professional duties were of course those connected with the Confessional, and these duties he violated in a manner so foul and so atrocious that no less than thirty-three young girls would appear to have fallen victims to his systematic and scientific profligacy. Not more than forty years of age, possessing a singularly handsome face and figure, Don Gurlino combined with the natural influence wielded over the mind of the youthful penitent by a spiritual guide, the influence, not less natural, of his own personal attractions. Both influences were skilfully brought to bear in the exciting privacy of the Confessional. All the opportunities which it affords of gradually, yet surely, tainting the mind were employed, and employed with too fatal a success. The wretch was, it appears, in the habit of accompanying his oral temptations with the appliances and means of obscene books and lascivious prints, to heighten and accelerate their effect. Working on the passions by a graduated scale of literary and pictorial excitement, the curate of ‘St. Charles’ and the ‘Carmelites,’ could seize for his infernal ends the exact moment when the unsuspecting confidence of girlhood prepared for him an easy prey. Don Gurlino was at last detected by the very means which he had employed. The relations of a young creature, one of his latest victims, found in her possession an obscene print, and insisted on her telling them from whom she had procured it. The girl refused for some time, but, yielding to their menaces, stammered forth the name of her confessor. She added, that not she alone, but likewise several of her young friends, had received from Don Gurlino immoral books and prints, and, debauched by his arts, had yielded up their honour to their spiritual guide. The relations at once communicated the facts to

and deposited the prints with the district police magistrate, who lost no time in communicating with the higher law authorities, and these latter at once instituted criminal proceedings against the priest.* Although the trial was conducted with closed doors, enough of the evidence transpired to fill all Turin with horror and indignation. The guilty acts of the criminal appear to have extended over a term of several years. The full extent of his debaucheries during all that period cannot, of course, be ascertained. One fact, however, is beyond all doubt—that on the trial itself thirty-three young girls bore testimony to the adoption towards themselves of the wicked acts of seduction with which the criminal stood charged. On this overwhelming mass of evidence Don Gurlino was found guilty, and sentenced by the Central Court of Turin, to seven years' solitary confinement. The term of sentence will probably be abridged by natural causes. Shame, if not remorse, has already worked such fearful ravages on the prisoner, that on the last day of the trial he was hardly any longer recognizable." *Times*, 16th May, 1860.†

The writer Dr. Ullathorne admits that many oppose the Confessional from professedly religious principles; certainly he must admit if honest, that RELIGIOUS objectors have a good deal to say for themselves. He says, "I am quite aware there is a numerous class of persons who profess to take up the cause in the sacred name of religion."

I thank him for this admission, I am one of that "numerous class;" I am conscientiously convinced that the questions to penitents, contained in the Romish works are obscene and grossly demoralizing, (indeed that is admitted by the late seizure of them,) and I have a perfect right (which Dr. Ullathorne cannot deny me) to warn my fellow creatures against the Confessional, and how the warning can be justified without reference to the Confessional books I cannot conceive, and if the Doctor can suggest any other way more palatable to him, and less distasteful to me, I shall be most obliged to him, and be only too glad to adopt it, provided the plan he proposes be equally effective. I protest I dislike the subject exceedingly and the books too, and if a law were passed for the burning of them, provided the originals are condemned to be burned along with them, I shall be quite content, but to destroy the translation and leave the originals, would be only to lop the branches and leave the root, they should be destroyed root and branch; and it is with a view to such radical destruction that my friend Mr. Scott and others have exposed the branches, and not to pander to the lower passions of men. It was, I believe, on religious principles and none other that the book has been published.

I was offered for sale by a Romish bookseller a copy of Den's Theology, containing the filth of the Confessional, and he is as a bookseller I suppose selling it for profit; why does not some Watch Committee come down upon him? To leave the root alone and lop

* They did not proceed against a *Mr. Scott* who hated the obscenity of the Confessional.

† How can any man know that his wife's Confessor is not a *Don Gurlino*?

the branches, is to "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel." I may ask here too how it happened that the Watch Committee attacked Mr. Scott, a townsman, and well known to all, and left Mr. Murphy alone—who gloried in exposing the translations, (on religious principles,) and challenged the authorities to prosecute him? was it that they expected their respected and respectable townsman, for peace sake, would give in and apologize, and that there would be an end of it, whilst they suspected Mr. Murphy was not quite of such squeezable materials, to say nothing of the fact that the books were long ago in the hands of the government authorities, who were not fools enough to prosecute him? So far for *direct* Popish tactics.

Now for the *indirect* tactics—through the medium of roughs and milk-and-water Protestants, &c.

II,—The recent events in Stone, Newcastle, Wolverhampton, Walsall, &c., ought to open the eyes of Protestants to a mode of attack which I have never heard of Protestants resorting to against Popish lecturers, viz:—to convey to the authorities, when anti-Popish lectures are announced, that there is a danger of a breach of the peace if the lectures take place.

Now if Protestants determined, previous to a Popish lecture, to break the heads of the lecturer, and his hearers, and that one of them told the magistrate that there would be bloodshed, after the bloodshedding arrangement having been made by the Protestants themselves, would the magistrate listen to him? undoubtedly not—the complainant would be laughed at, and such a Protestant would deserve to be kicked out of court.

But Popery wants to subdue England to the Romish faith, (so Dr. Manning says—I mean the titular of Westminster,) and therefore it is of the greatest importance that Protestant tongues should be tied, lest this subjugation should be in the least degree interfered with; accordingly the "lambs" are allowed (if not directed) to threaten "battle, murder and sudden death," both to Protestant lecturers and hearers, and when this amiable organization of "lambs"—(Popery has horns like a lamb, "and a voice like a dragon,"—Rev. xiii, 11.) And when the bloodshed is arranged, away goes some quiet amiable gentleman, either a Papist or a poor Protestant gull, (it matters not which, the gull perhaps the best) and lugubriously warns the Mayor or some other gentleman in authority, of what is brooding, and tells him not to allow the lecture, otherwise there will be bloodshed.

What righteous judge would allow the plea of a robber, who excused himself for threatening his victim's life, by saying he only did it for the purpose of *preventing himself* from murdering that victim?

So Papists threaten to shed the blood of Protestants, and beg of the magistrate to *prevent their own bloodthirstiness*, by making the Protestants hold their noise!!

This beats out the Irishman at the fair, who made a great demonstration of rage against somebody or other, and was so much afraid of the awful things he *himself* was about to do, that he said to his friend by his side, "ould me Pat, you know my timper;" but Papists now

surpass this, for they say to stipendiaries, &c., "hould the Protestants for you know our timper." Will it be believed that in this boasted land of law and liberty, such brazen impudence was actually perpetrated by Popery in this very town? and will it be further believed that this same brazen impudence produced its effect upon the authorities? Yet such is the fact. It is fresh in the memory of us all, that when the "lambs" began to break the chairs in the hall, I intreated the Stipendiary Magistrate personally to protect us, and he absolutely refused to do so to my face, this refusal being simply the result of mob violence. He knew their timper!

Now I take leave to tell Mr. Spooner, that he had no right to refuse me protection, (that refusal too being made before a crowd, some of whom might tell the rioters of the refusal, and thus encourage them in their lawlessness,) he is paid for protecting the peaceable and loyal subjects of Her Majesty, and not for leaving them to the mercy of lawless miscreants; I was simply engaged as chairman of a public meeting, and Mr. Spooner must have been perfectly aware of the lawfulness of my position, and the Government pronounced upon the lawfulness of those particular meetings, as appeared at the time, and therefore I say Mr. Spooner was guilty of a dereliction of duty, when he refused to protect me and other Protestants, and I have to complain bitterly—that I, a stranger in your town, and a clergyman, and as such a man of peace—was left by this paid officer to protect myself as best I could, against an infuriated mob, armed with broken chairs, (and for what I know with worse,) with one of which I was wounded and might have been killed; and I also take this opportunity of stating that Mr. Davis, a Stipendiary Magistrate at Burslem, as if these Stipendiaries were leagued with the Priests and their myrmidons, told me that his protection of me against the denunciation of a Priest at Newcastle, (to which two credible witnesses offered to swear,) would depend upon whether my peaceable conduct "on all occasions entitled me to it," (see *Staffordshire Sentinel* of 2nd of March, 1867); now we know what Priestly denunciation means, it means a wink to the "lambs" of Popery to attack the denounced, and accordingly my life has been several times threatened since the denunciation; but what cared Mr. Davis—(no more than Mr. Spooner, who really "did not see the chairs broken" *through stone walls*!) the denouncer was a holy Priest and the denounced was only a Protestant Clergyman! So that these two Stipendiary servants of the public, instead of frowning upon the turbulent and insolent, frowned upon the peaceable and orderly. I challenge any person to prove any violence practiced by me at any time, and I have not the least idea of allowing myself to be outlawed by any Magistrate, without at all events crying out against such infamous injustice with all my might.

Mr. Davis forsooth must be satisfied of my peaceable conduct "on all occasions" (these are his very words,) before he will protect me! Bravo, Stipendiary! So then there must be an *inquisition* I suppose upon my conduct; or I suppose I am to be put into a kind of "Confessional" box, got up especially for Protestant Parsons who dare to

complain of Priestly denunciations, and Popish threats, and I am to undergo this ordeal by a special arrangement between the Popish Priest and the Stipendiary Magistrates, before I receive protection from a priestly denunciation, which may cost me my life! Truly a righteous judge! A second Daniel come to judgment! May God preserve me from coming before Mr. Davis for judgment again; if so, I shall if possible appeal against him as having dealt unjustly with me before. Again, by his reference to my conduct "on all occasions" in the midst of my parishioners, he cast an unjust insinuation upon my hitherto peaceable character, which was calculated to bring me into contempt with them, and that without my ever having given the slightest provocation for such an unjust and impudent aspersion; he has prostituted his position of magistrate, to express his unaccountable personal spleen against me—a man that never injured him in thought, word, or deed,—Solomon says, "Strive not with a man without a cause, if he have done thee no harm." I hope Mr. Davis will be brought to know the wisdom of this proverb. I always understood that even a bad character, is entitled to the protection of the law, but this *Daniel* tells me to the effect, that no matter how good my character may be *now*, if I cannot prove to his satisfaction that my conduct had been "on all occasions" one continued tissue of peaceableness and gentleness, I am disentitled to his protection! No allowance will be made even for my school-boy and college days—the word is "on all occasions"—a freak of my boyhood would cut me off from the protection of this righteous judge!

I may say of these two UNPROTECTING MAGISTRATES *par nobile fratrum*.

But to show there was plenty of power to protect us in Wolverhampton had the authorities pleased, we find after all the mischief was done, a party of police marched into the room, which could at first have quelled the riot in two minutes, indeed their presence would have been enough, but this would not suit the purpose of the authorities, which appeared to me to be to make us feel the effects of mob violence, and thus deter the lecturer from continuing his lectures. Who does not know that if a few stout policemen had been directed to go in and arrest the chair breakers and rioters, they could have done so with the greatest ease; give a mob license (particularly if they think the authorities sympathize with them) and we know the results, "behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth," James iii, 5. All the expense to which the town was put, might have been saved if the ruffians were shown that their truculence would not be allowed; but it seems to have been hoped that Mr. Murphy would have been deterred from proceeding, by being deliberately left to mob violence, and that thus all trouble would be saved to the authorities! Had he yielded, the Irish mob would have ruled the town, and how the authorities could, for their own sakes, have wished him to yield, seems the strangest part of this strange transaction, surely the authorities (whether they liked Mr. Murphy or not) ought not to wish to be over-ridden by an Irish mob! In my opinion, Mr. Murphy, who could (being a layman) fight the battle more consistently than I

could, (when it came to physical violence,) deserves the thanks of the town, if it were only for saving them from degradation and abasement. But no! In this case the rulers were not a terror to evil doers, but to the quiet and peaceable; so that I who either by profession or inclination, am indisposed to physical violence, was obliged to withdraw, unless I was prepared to earn a character for muscular christianity, which my opponents would not be slack to apply to me. The cry was "great is the Confessional of Popery," the exposure of which would bring the "craft into danger."

A similar uproar occurred in Ephesus, when the cry was "great is Diana of the Ephesians;" but even the heathen Town Clerk said, "we are in danger to be called in question for this day's uproar," Acts xix, 40,—how much more ought professed christian authorities to be called in question for such an unjustifiable uproar as this broken chairs affair.

But our adversaries say, "why deliver lectures so offensive to Roman Catholics?" I answer why do not Priests come forward and prove the lectures wrong? If they did so instead of allowing their "lambs" to break people's heads, it would be more to their credit. we don't beat Roman Catholics for offensive lectures against Protestants.

I think it very offensive that Dr. Manning should call us heathen, but I should be grieved to see the poor man's head broken with the back of a chair for all that, and I think I would defend him from such violence if I could.

Besides the "Confessional" is highly offensive to Protestants. If the Priests even kept it to themselves and did not try to recruit their *penitents!* from our ranks, it would not be quite so bad, though bad enough, but they avow their intention to convert us all to the "Confessional" (Dr. Manning is quite decided on that point).

Now I say it is very natural for us poor heathen husbands and fathers to wish to know what will be done with our poor heathen wives and daughters when they are converted to "Confessional" christianity. It is rather too facetious that mayors and stipendiaries (who may not care whether *their* wives and daughters are so converted to confessionality) are to try and prevent us (who do care) from ascertaining what is in store for our female relatives when they quit their ignorant heathenism for the more polished education they will receive from bachelor Priests by the Priestly (qy. beastly) questions in the "Confessional"—Popery may preach its kind of christianity "'til the crack of doom," only let us know what it is beforehand, and let not the authorities prevent men who know what it is, from explaining it to us, and if in the explanation there be anything incorrect, let the professors of the "Confessional" christianity set it right by arguments and proofs, but in the name of all that is fair and upright let them not break our heads when we enquire what their own books teach.

There is another reason why I feel specially indignant that there should be any hindrance on the part of the authorities to the "Confessional" being unmasked, viz:—that some Clergymen in the Church

of England are trying to introduce the Confessional into our Church? Now the Confessional may be very good or very bad, but we Church people have a special right to be informed on the subject. I believe it has not been introduced amongst dissenters, but it is certainly a new introduction in our Church, and as I have shown contrary to our homilies; and as there are no *authorized* rules of questioning females in our Church, we who are jealous of the honour of such females will insist upon knowing what are the rules authorized by our "adversaries," as our homily entitles the "auricular confession" men; and I repeat again, if any of our authorities are such *Gallios* as not to care for what snares are laid *for their wives and daughters*, and if they don't object to *Don Gurlinos*, we must give them to understand that they are welcome to their *Gallioism*, as far as they and *their wives and daughters* are concerned; but they shan't interfere with our natural right to protect the virtue and purity of *our wives and daughters*. If there be a subject on which a man will fight more desperately than another, we all know that it is for the the honour and dignity of his wife, his daughter, or his sister, therefore let there be no terms with those who oppose us on this point; and let it be clearly understood that no compromise whatever will be listened to *for one moment* on this subject; I frankly proclaim myself perfectly intolerant of any the slightest interference with my right to know what is in store for my female relatives should they be ensnared into Popery.

I consider it the grossest oppression and persecution on the part of the authorities, to try and prevent men from hearing the tenets of Popery discussed, when that system is *openly declaring that it is doing its best* to induce us to embrace those tenets.

Now be it remembered that the nation has passed sentence upon that system three hundred years ago, and therefore the authorities of the nation "forget their position," (I thank Dr. Ullathorne for the words,) when they throw obstacles in the way of those who stand up for the national protest against it. It must be remembered that Popery is *Nationally Condemned* already, it is not an open question at all, so that the protestors against it are quite in their "position," and have a national right to protection, instead of which it has come to pass in this town, that the protestors against it are treated as tho' they were wrong doers, and as if they were doing something very strange!

And this very system, nationally condemned, is now openly boasting that she seeks to bring us back to the darkness of Popery, and when we enquire what it is to which we are to be brought back, a paid Magistrate is to tell me, whilst engaged in the enquiry,— "Sir, I can't protect you," and the translation of our adversaries' books, which explain what they wish us to be converted to, is ordered to be destroyed.

O tempora, O Mores! who would have ever believed that we should ever come to this in Protestant England! So then we are not even to be allowed to get the books in plain English—which tell us what we are to believe, when we are converted, and what is to be

done to our female relatives; in fact we are to buy a *Pig in a bag*, we must take on trust all that Dr. Manning or Dr. Ullathorne choose to teach us, and the magistrates will have it so, and if we dare to enquire into their books our brains are to be dashed out, and truly if we suffered such an imposition we deserve to have them dashed out, that is if we had, under such circumstances, any such commodities as brains at all, which would be very questionable.

The following resolution was passed at a Romish meeting held at Hanley, 27th last March,—“That it is the solemn declaration of this meeting, founded on the experience of every Catholic husband and father, that the Confessional, instead of tending to the debasement of morality, is one of its most effectual safe-guards.” Bravo! bravo!! then I ask—first, why Dr. Ullathorne says there is provision made for “solicitation” of females in the Confessional? Second, I would ask, was it “the experience” of the “fathers and brothers” of the 33 young lady victims of *Don Gurlino*, that the Confessional was one of the most effectual safe-guards “to morality?” these fathers and brothers would scarcely agree with the Hanley fathers and brothers; and third, I would ask if it be such a “safe-guard to morality,” why are our heads to be broken for enquiring what the Romish books say of it?

III, and this brings me to consider the last and most intolerable of the secret tactics of Popery or of her allies, viz:—the attempt to bring down the strong arm of the law against enquiry.

We have already considered the manœuvre of trying to sow dis-sension amongst Protestants.

Then the appeal to the fears of Protestants, by threats of bloodshed, both indirectly through the authorities, and directly by anonymous letters.

Now for the legal proceedings.

I suppose, as the case of our respected friend Mr. Scott, is still *sub-judice*, I must not presume to pass sentence one way or another, but as he has appealed against the judgment already passed, we are at liberty to make an observation or two on that appeal which is matter of notoriety.

Now there is no question about the obscene matter contained in the books which he disposed of, all parties are agreed in that, but there are certain admissions made by Mr. Scott's opponents, which we, his friends, have a right to make use of.

He is admitted then to be a most respectable gentleman, therefore at the first blush it is not likely he would at his time of life dispose of books containing obscene matter, for any improper purpose, and how any of his townsmen could have attempted to make it out that he did so, (and they never could have believed that he did so,) is mysterious in the extreme, the *odium Theologicum* is generally bitter enough, but here there is scarcely any accounting for it, except by the secret organization of Popery. This Watch Committee have however undertaken a job which will under any circumstances do irreparable damage to Popery; leaving the Watch Committee out of the question, Popery is in a dilemma—and serve her right, for she brought her-

self into it—for if the “Confessional Unmasked” be condemned, it is obvious, as has been already very properly shown by placards in the town—Maynooth is condemned from whose books the extracts are taken; and if the books be not condemned, then the right of exposing Popery in its most vulnerable part, a right which we know we had before, is freshly vindicated by law, and Popery is proved to be a wicked system *by law*, and that even on her own showing—for she admits that the book, or rather maintains that the book, contains abominable obscenities.

And again, if the book be not condemned another remarkable result follows, viz:—that although the sale of obscene books generally is prohibited by law, yet such is the abominable character of Popery, that it will be ruled that it is preferable to allow the sale of these books containing obscenity, rather than people should be left ignorant of the nature of Popery, so that the allowance of the legality of the sale will be a strong legal condemnation of Popery as a system, in addition to the condemnation 300 years ago.

But as to our excellent friend Mr. Scott, with whom I most sincerely sympathize, on account of the annoyance inflicted on himself and family, because he sincerely desired, from religious principles, to warn his fellow men against the evils of Popery; I have to say that even Dr. Ullathorne himself admits that many oppose the Confessional on professedly religious principles, his words are,—“I am quite aware that there is a numerous class of persons who profess to take up the cause in the sacred name of religion.”

Now when even Dr. Ullathorne admits so far, it is strange that the Watch Committee did not give such a respectable gentleman as Mr. Scott the benefit of such an admission, even made by an adversary; but no! all his respectability and the position of his family was ignored, just to obtain a momentary stupid triumph against him, but it is all in vain.—It is not often that a verdict, no matter whether it be *pro* or *con*, will serve the cause of truth equally well, and yet such is the case in this instance; but that he must be honourably acquitted is what friend and enemy must see, as the conditions necessary to a legal condemnation are absolutely absent in his case as appeared on the first trial, it being evident on the trial, that he did not dispose of the books for profit; and his admitted respectability of character, his age, and the openness of his proceedings negative the idea of his disposing of the books for immoral purposes.

Does not the scripture throw some light on the mode in which such work as “auricular confession” ought to be treated? I believe it does, the Bible is the religion of Protestants, we find a remarkable passage in Luke xii, 1, 2, 3—where Christ warns his disciples to “beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. “For” he says, “there is nothing covered (*i.e.* under a mask) that shall not be revealed, nor hidden (still masked) that shall not be known.”

This is a prophecy that the hypocritical covering of sinful secret practices shall all come out, it shows that hypocrisy is only short-sighted after all, for it shall be “unmasked” sooner or later.

Now the “Confessional” is a secret tribunal under the mask of

religion, and the corrupting nature oozes out, by the admission made by Dr. Ullathorne, that provision is made for cases of attempted corruption of females; now no such provision would be made if there were no acknowledged danger in the practice. Our Church, for instance, makes no law about females denouncing Protestant Clergymen who might wickedly solicit them. Why? because there is no "auricular confession" allowed in our Church, (see homily on repentance); there is no ordinance in the Church of England which involves any danger to the morals of either male or female; now observe, I am not contending that Protestant Clergymen have not been, and may not be still, carried away by sin of impurity, but they can't do it under a cloak of religion, for they have no (so called) religious ordinance, which puts them in the way of such. In other words Protestantism puts not men and women in the way of danger, under the hypocritical garb of religion, but Popery does.

The Popish Confessional is a snare to both Priests and penitents, hence the necessity of a *special provision*, ostensibly for the protection of female honour. Now it is incredible that an organization such as this would have no antidote in the scripture, or that Christ himself would not have said something which might guard us against such hypocrisy.

The warning is in the above passage, which denounces the "secret things of darkness," though the warning is only general.

But the application of Christ's warning is still more pointed against the "Auricular Confession," for he says, "that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed on the housetops." Now this is a thunderbolt against "Auricular Confession" it is pointed at in so many words—"that which ye have spoken in the ear." "Auricular Confession" is that "which is spoken in the ear;" and again, spoken "in closets," the Confessional box is a "closet;" all shall come out into light! Now if Christ wished to allude to the hypocrisy of the Confessional, in what plainer words could he have denounced it? surely it is in keeping with another passage—1 Tim. vi, 1, &c.,—"in the latter time some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in *hypocrisy*," observe "*hypocrisy*" again, is the mark of the great apostacy—putting the mask of religion over that most corrupting ordinance, an ordinance so corrupting, that as we have seen, Dr. Ullathorne acknowledges it was necessary to adopt a provision by way of safe-guard, which provision is a homage to public opinion, even in Romish countries where some kind of security (however weak) was afforded to men, that their female relatives would be protected from solicitation by Priests.

The villany of the practice is thus plainly alluded to in the above text, but there is more taught here, for the mode of dealing with the abomination is also taught, viz:—that it is to be dealt with *openly and frankly*.

It is not said by Christ here, that the evil practices are so abominable that they can't be exposed! as some very elegant and fastidious gentlemen who wish to screen Popery have said—no, no,

he says it must be "proclaimed upon the housetops;" some gentlemen have begged of me not to countenance Mr. Murphy, because he says such gross things, and that so openly, (as it were "upon the housetops").

Well, I admit he does say gross things, but they are only quotations from "from what is spoken in the ear in closets," which, Christ says, "shall come abroad into the light." These nice gentlemen say—Oh, but he does it so openly! True, but is not that just what Christ says must be done, and is it not better than whispering obscenity into the ears of females?

All this is very shocking, but I say which is better, to let the public know what is in store for all female perverts to Popery, or to paint that system *Couleur de rose*, and thus leave our females to the danger, if not certainty of pollution?

Therefore Mr. Scott in distributing the "Confessional Unmasked" is *in some measure*, tho' possibly without being aware of it, fulfilling Christ's sentence against "Auricular Confession," only he has not gone quite so far as this prophetic denunciation of Christ, for he limited the sale of these books to a certain class of persons.

Now the Magistrate's sentence against Mr. Scott was this,—that "that which is spoken in the ear in closets" *should not* "come to light." But CHRIST'S SENTENCE IS "THAT WHICH IS SPOKEN IN THE EAR IN CLOSETS SHALL BE PROCLAIMED UPON THE HOUSETOPS." Which of these two sentences, that of the Magistrate, or that of Christ, is most likely to be established? I leave you, my christian friends to judge; and that English Magistrates should help forward the concealing of the work of the Confessional, until public opinion overbore them, is most marvellous, and indeed most ominous and truly suspicious.

From Christ's prophetic language, I expect a much greater exposure of "Auricular Confession" than has yet taken place—for, saith Christ, "Heaven and earth may pass away, but my word shall not pass away;" therefore his sentence, that "that which is spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light," "shall not pass away until all be fulfilled;" and the very noise made on the subject is, by God's providence, bringing the iniquity more and more into the light, so that the screeners of the Confessional are the unwitting instruments in God's hands, of exposing it; truly "he maketh the wrath of man to praise him, and the remainder he restrains"

"Very shocking," say some sanctimonious people, "very shocking that such obscenity should be exposed." It is very shocking, but it is more shocking that the obscenity should be allowed to fester, and corrupt the body politic. If the Confessional be allowed to progress, and that all our wives and daughters are to be brought under its baneful influence, (Dr. Manning's design,) it will corrupt the whole nation; better let it be exposed on real religious principles (the religious manner of the exposure being a great safeguard against any evil consequences) than to have the obscenity introduced into the ears of your wives and daughters, on the plea that the secret investigation of obscenity is a part of religion.

In other words, the exposure ought to be considered the religious act, and the screening ought to be branded as not merely contrary to religion, but even to common decency. Notwithstanding all the vituperation heaped upon Mr. Murphy, it is impossible for any unprejudiced person who hears him not to be convinced of the sincere abhorrence he entertains for the obscenity which he exposes. Dr. Ullathorne's admission that some undertake the cause "in the sacred name of religion" is strikingly exemplified in the case of Mr. Murphy. Had there been a stain upon his moral character, he would not dare to speak out as he does, and with all the spite of his enemies, I have heard of no attempt to asperse his moral character.

It is cunningly (but falsely) argued that by the exposure of "Auricular Confession" we are liable to produce the evil we desire to cure—a false argument—utterly false. If the thing be wicked, let it be exposed and leave the result to God. It is evident that the blessing of God is more likely to follow an endeavour to eradicate wickedness than to hide it; and how wickedness can be eradicated (especially a wickedness intended for the million—for all are required to confess) without exposure I can't see. If the system were intended only for a few, the exposure might be more limited, but the system is intended for *all*, (and boasted of as intended for *all*,) therefore I can't see myself, how the evil can be cured without a very large exposure.

Will any man tell me that the obscenity of the "Confessional" is enough (in the sight of God) to exonerate christians from struggling to overthrow it? It is contrary to common sense to suppose that God would ever *allow* or sanction the principle that the more enormous the sinful practice is the more it should be kept hidden, or in other words, that *the enormity of the sin should be its own protector*. If God ever established such a principle or law as that, would not God be establishing a law for the connivance at, and continuing a wicked practice? "Is Christ the minister of sin?" God forbid. But if he decreed that the magnitude of a wicked practice was to be its own protection, would he not be the "minister of sin?" "I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say."

I have seen an absurd allusion to certain passages of Leviticus and other parts of Holy Scripture, which are compared to the filthy questions in the Confessional. There is not the slightest analogy, for first, those passages give no sanction whatever to a secret questioning of females by bachelor Priests in closets, who if they are *pure* bachelors ought to know nothing whatever on the subject.

And secondly, the allusions to certain sins in Leviticus are not calculated to do injury, because they are openly alluded to, and are written under the halo of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and the comparison between what is written by inspiration and what is written by Messrs. Liguori, Dens & Co. is so purely absurd that it would be absolutely laughable, if it were not so atrociously impudent and blasphemous.

There are certain sins which nature itself protests against, and therefore they do not require the doctoring of Popish Priests to an-

atomize and probe into. The Apostle Paul tells that "nature itself teaches us" some *even simple improprieties*, how much more sins of a gross nature, from which the mind naturally recoils, and even the practice of which cannot obliterate the testimony of the conscience against them.

Therefore I conclude that Christ in warning his disciples against the Pharisees' "hypocrisy," (that is "masquerading") and in telling them that the mask must be torn off the secret whispering in the ear (such as Auricular Confession) sanctions the principle of "unmasking the Confessional."

The "Confessional Unmasked" is the bringing "into light the secret things of darkness," which Christ declared must be done, and I therefore expect God's blessing to follow Mr. Murphy's exposing of the iniquity.

CONCLUSION.—And therefore I congratulate you upon your determination to exercise your legitimate power as Protestants of all denominations, forgetting your minor differences, in resisting the encroachments of that foreign system which seeks to put a yoke upon your necks, that neither you nor your fathers were able to bear; and more especially that you combine together for the withdrawal of public money, for the support of Maynooth, where the books are taught from which the "Confessional Unmasked" is translated; and that you will insist upon the opening of Nunneries to the inspection of Magistrates.

I find there is another edition of the "Confessional Unmasked" called for, and advertisements have been sent to the papers, calling upon those who object to the present translation to propose a better, and such propositions shall have all due attention; after this let us hear no more of "false translations."

Since the above was sent to press Mr. Scott has been honourably acquitted by the Recorder of Wolverhampton, and the impounded copies of the "Confessional Unmasked," admitted to be faithful translations, ordered to be restored.

The Recorder gives his *private opinion* against the "circulation of the extracts;" but if that gentleman had some female relations perverted and treated as the 33 girls were by *Don Gurlino*, it is probable even he might alter his opinion and think with many whose female relations have been perverted, that the world at large ought to be warned of the foul iniquity of the Confessional. Those who are not sufferers themselves are often very cool about the sufferings of others. If for instance Mr. Murphy's *gentlemanlike* vituperators saw their fathers murdered by Popery, before their eyes, as he did his, they would speak probably as strongly as he does; and they might well call him "that unhappy man," not in scorn but in sympathy.



